UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN GREEN BAY DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF A	AMERICA,)	
	Plaintiff,)	Case No. CR 18-223 Green Bay, Wisconsin
vs.)	
)	July 12, 2019
PETER BERNEGGER,)	3:30 p.m.
)	
	Defendant.)	

TRANSCRIPT OF REVIEW HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: United States Department of

Justice (WI-ED)

Office of the US Attorney

By: WILLIAM J. ROACH 205 Doty St - Ste 301

Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301-4541

Ph: 920-884-1066 Fax: 920-884-2997

william.j.roach@usdoj.gov

For the Defendant: PETER M. BERNEGGER

3415 Park Dr

Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235

Ph: 920-810-8339

PRO SE

U.S. Probation Office: AMY J. KOSMOSKI

U.S. Official Transcriber: JOHN T. SCHINDHELM, RMR, CRR,

Transcript Orders: WWW.JOHNSCHINDHELM.COM

Proceedings recorded by electronic recording, transcript produced by computer aided transcription.



1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 2 Transcribed From Audio Recording 3 4 THE COURT: Be seated. 5 THE CLERK: The court calls Case No. 18-CR-223, United 6 States of America vs. Peter M. Bernegger for a review hearing. 7 May I have the appearances, please? 8 MR. ROACH: Good afternoon. William Roach on behalf 9 of the Government. 10 MR. BERNEGGER: Peter Bernegger for Defendant. 11 THE COURT: And? 12 PROBATION OFFICER: Amy Kosmoski on behalf of 13 Probation. 14 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 15 MR. BERNEGGER: Ah, Your Honor, I object to Amy 16 Kosmoski being here. There's a court order that she was removed 17 from my case for some vulgar activity that she did in front of 18 myself and my parents who were witnesses. And I believe you 19 signed the order -- or, I forget the magistrate judge. I move 20 immediately that you disqualify Amy Kosmoski from this case as 21 she already has been. It's on the record in the court order. 22 THE COURT: I don't know of this order, Mr. Roach. Do 23 you know what he's talking about? 24 MR. ROACH: Right.

MR. BERNEGGER: And I move for a continuance until

25

there's a --

THE COURT: No. Sit down. Sit down.

MR. BERNEGGER: -- probation officer --

THE COURT: Ms. Kosmoski, do you know what he's talking about?

PROBATION OFFICER: I do, Your Honor.

I supervised Mr. Bernegger on pretrial. He was still a district in Mississippi case at that time, so any order that would have been made would have been through the district in Mississippi.

THE COURT: And was there an order disqualifying you or removing you?

PROBATION OFFICER: I just recall that my supervisor took me off the case because he alleged that I high-fived a secretary.

MR. BERNEGGER: Objection, Your Honor. The order is issued by this court. She was removed from my case.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to remove her from the courtroom. My sense is she will not have much -- this is a review hearing, Mr. Bernegger. Probation isn't on trial here, nor are you for that matter. This is just a hearing that I set at the time we set a payment schedule just to see how things were going.

MR. BERNEGGER: Your Honor, I object because there's a petition out there that specifically states that I'm facing --

that is alleged against me that I'm facing a revocation of probation.

THE COURT: No, you're not.

MR. BERNEGGER: And that's documented, document no. 11, a petition filed by Kevin Norman.

THE COURT: I explained this to you last time,

Mr. Bernegger. When you were here last time before me I

explained that this was probably a mistake to say -- issue a

show cause why your term should not be revoked.

If you read the entire petition, you would have seen that Probation was really asking that -- the last paragraph of the petition:

"Since his supervised release commenced on September 23rd, 2014, Mr. Bernegger has resided in New London, Wisconsin. He has no ties to the Northern District... intends to remain in Eastern District of Wisconsin through his term of supervised release. Mr. Bernegger has recently reported that he has a job waiting for him in Florida when his supervised release is completed. When asked why he can't accept the job now, he stated the company doesn't want to deal with the government. As court intervention is necessary, we would ask Your Honor to order a Notice to Appear to address his lack of payment and set a more clear condition as far as restitution payment is concerned. Our office has previously asked Mr. Bernegger to sign a waiver agreeing to modification of his conditions, but he

declined."

So I think if you had read it all, you would have seen that they were seeking a modification. And, in fact, this is clear from document 2, which is the Request for Modifying the Conditions or Term of Supervision with Consent of the Offender they asked me at that time to modify. I directed the clerk — or without consent of. I think I directed the clerk at that time to accept jurisdiction and schedule a hearing for modification of conditions. This was back in December.

Unfortunately they accepted supervision, that got done, but we did not -- the clerk's office didn't schedule the hearing to modify your conditions. Obviously conditions had to be modified 'cause no one had set a payment schedule. All that read was that you owed whatever, I forget the amount, some -- over a million dollars in restitution, well over a million dollars in restitution and had paid nothing.

And no one expects -- from what I know of your financial resources -- you to pay over a million dollars in restitution, even though that's apparently what the court found you had defrauded people from, but they did expect you to make some sort of good faith effort.

So when you were here last in front of me, I made it clear that we were not seeking to revoke your supervision. We wanted to set a payment schedule. I set a payment schedule.

And I took into consideration the fact that you were not -- did

not have rental or mortgage obligations, and that you seemed to
be healthy and you even told Probation at one time you had a job

3 waiting for you in Florida.

You indicated at that time that you had significant health problems that prevented you from being able to hold a job. I said that would certainly be an excuse or a justification for not making payments, but you would need to establish that through medical reports.

Presumably if you have such severe health problems you have doctors that you had seen that have noted your health problems, that have put you under restrictions that somehow prevent you from work. You're supposed to provide that information to your probation officer.

My understanding, though, from the memo I received, and I think this was from Mr. Kevin Norman -- who apparently is on vacation, Ms. Kosmoski?

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you're here to take notes, is that essentially what your role is? You're not supervising Mr. Bernegger.

PROBATION OFFICER: I'm not. I've communicated with Mr. Norman, though, about his compliance so that if the Court should have any questions I'm prepared to answer.

THE COURT: Yeah. Well, it does seem to me from my review of Mr. Norman's report that Mr. Bernegger was looking for

employment.

He has not provided the medical attention -- he's provided a lot of medical information, but none that indicates any severe medical condition that, you know, with restrictions that prevent him from working. But if I recall correctly, it appeared he has consistently provided our office with employment search efforts. Also provided cash flow statements and things of that nature.

So, Mr. Bernegger, I guess what we put it on for is to address how you're doing. And I recognize you want to go back and make this your case against Probation, but that's not the purpose of today's hearing. I dismissed your action against the probation agents. If you want to bring that action, if you want to appeal that, that's your choice. This is about you, though, it's not about Probation.

And the question here is what can you tell me about your efforts to find employment or what medical conditions really prevent you from being able to make some effort to pay something toward the restitution. And as I understand it, the only payments made toward the immense amount of restitution you owe is -- was through tax intercepts that happened not with your assistance but despite your failure to make any payments.

So what can you tell me about your job search or your medical conditions?

MR. BERNEGGER: Well, then I want to call Amy Kosmoski

24

25

REVIEW HEARING July 12, 2019

as my first witness to the stand to put on evidence and

THE COURT: No, we're not going to have evidence. Just tell me what you -- what your condition is. She doesn't know your condition. You're the one --

MR. BERNEGGER: I filed the --

THE COURT: -- with direct knowledge of what you've done and what your condition is. Ms. Kosmoski has no information. She's here, as she said, simply to report to her

MR. BERNEGGER: I can use Ms. Kosmoski as a witness to introduce evidence to the Court, answers that you're asking.

THE COURT: No, I'm asking you. I'm asking you what have you done to try to find employment and what evidence do you have or what is your medical condition?

MR. BERNEGGER: You just asked me what evidence, but you won't let me present it. I object to that.

THE COURT: Why would I not -- why would I ask somebody else to tell me what you have done?

MR. BERNEGGER: First, Your Honor, I asked to clarify, is document no. 11, which is petition no. 2, filed on May 3rd, is that dismissed? Is that what I understand you just told me?

THE COURT: Well, to the extent that it asks for revocation, it's denied.

MR. BERNEGGER: And that's the first I heard of that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, no, I explained this at the last hearing, Mr. Bernegger.

MR. BERNEGGER: I object. I have a transcript with me. I've read it 10 times. You did not dismiss this petition of revocation against me.

THE COURT: I didn't dismiss it. I said no one was seeking to revoke your supervision on that day. And frankly, no one is seeking to revoke your supervision now.

You were asked -- I modified the conditions, as I indicated. And the purpose of the modification was to have you make some payments before your supervision expires, as I understand it, in September.

I'm not sure, Mr. Roach, is there a basis or grounds or a lawful way we can extend supervision so he can make some payments or are we -- is this at the end of it and it becomes a financial --

MR. ROACH: This is a significant FLU issue. The defendant has been ordered. I asked at the last hearing, made clear that the defendant be ordered as a condition of his release to comply with FLU documents. The defendant has --

MR. BERNEGGER: Objection, Your Honor.

MR. ROACH: Can I finish?

THE COURT: No, no. Let him finish, Mr. Bernegger, then I'll ask you your position. He's not offering evidence, he's offering a history and procedural information.

Go ahead, Mr. Roach.

MR. ROACH: The government believes a reasonable condition of his supervised release is that he comply with any FLU requests, financial litigation unit requests from our office to supply financial statements, financial documents in the interests of continuing to honor his restitution requirement, \$1.725 million.

The defendant -- when I brought this to the attention of the parties --

Again, the defendant's well aware of his FLU requirements. When I brought this to the attention of the parties at the last hearing on May 24th, the Court agreed that that was a valid condition of his supervised release, that he comply with presenting any financial-related documents to Probation, to the Court, to the FLU office, our office, and I thought it was made clear.

THE COURT: Is it not in the -- I think I modified conditions and included the payment schedule, did it include the financial responsibility reporting?

MR. ROACH: The Court said the general phrasing of the supervised release condition included and encompassed FLU. It does not specifically mention the acronym "FLU."

THE COURT: What is the condition you're referring to?

MR. ROACH: It's the -- I had it here a second ago.

(Brief pause.)

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. ROACH: The specific supervision conditions. it here a second ago.

THE COURT: I see the order entered on May 24th -actually June 4th. Well, nunc pro tunc May 24th, modified the conditions by adding that he uses best efforts to find and hold lawful full-time employment, and that he pay restitution at a rate of \$100 per month or 20 percent of his net income, whichever is greater.

Those were the conditions added at that time. Were there other conditions in the judgment itself?

MR. ROACH: There are. I know we discussed the specific phrasing of that -- of the condition involving his requirement to comply with submitting financial documents.

I know there's an order from the Northern District of Mississippi. It is document no. 454 in their case that reads, "The defendant shall provide to the U.S. Probation Service full disclosure of his financial status and fully cooperate regarding his financial status while under supervision."

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bernegger, that would include that you cooperate and provide the information that the FLU unit of the U.S. Attorney in the Eastern District of Wisconsin needs in order to assess and collect, if it's possible, restitution. You may speak now and tell me what your objection is and why you haven't done that.

MR. BERNEGGER: I have several objections, Your Honor.

First off, I have given zero -- I was given zero notice that this issue would be brought up today.

Also, I asked my probation officer twice, in writing, to provide me with the written FLU condition. Okay? The court order. He never did, with the exception of the document that Mr. Roach is just saying.

However, first off, the text order that was issued by you yesterday on July 10th, document 97, says, quote, "The hearing will address defendant's current efforts to pay restitution and his explanations for his failure to do so. If additional time is necessary ..." blah, blah, blah.

I was not noticed that a FLU condition was going to be heard today or argued today, and I had no adequate notice. And I would request again to call Amy Kosmoski to the witness stand so I can enter evidence and show that that's not a condition.

MR. ROACH: That's not true, Judge. The update for the 7/12/19 review hearing --

MR. BERNEGGER: I'm not done yet.

MR. ROACH: -- dated July 8th --

MR. BERNEGGER: I'm not done yet. Objection.

MR. ROACH: -- July 8th --

MR. BERNEGGER: I was looking for a document.

THE COURT: Yeah. What document are you looking for?

MR. BERNEGGER: Document no. 56.

THE COURT: Okay. You look for your document.

Mr. Roach, what were you saying?

MR. ROACH: Mr. Norman's update memo dated July 8th,
"Update for July 12th Review Hearing," specifically lists in his
recommendation: "We would request that the Court order
Mr. Bernegger to fully cooperate with FLU and provide them with
any documentation they request."

Mr. Norman and Mr. Bernegger have gone back and forth through May, June, July about the FLU documents. Mr. Norman has sent the FLU documents to Mr. Bernegger, Mr. Bernegger refuses to fill them out. He is in possession of what we want.

THE COURT: Okay. So he has been sent the FLU documents, "FLU" meaning the financial litigation unit --

MR. ROACH: -- unit. Financial statements and such.

THE COURT: And these are --

MR. ROACH: Mr. Bernegger has responded saying show me the condition that requires me to fill these documents out.

THE COURT: And you have shown him. You said, "with the exception of the order that Mr. Roach read."

I take it, Mr. Bernegger, you have the order that Mr. Roach read from the Northern District of Mississippi that ordered you to comply with the providing of financial information?

MR. BERNEGGER: Oh, I have the transcript, Your Honor, but it doesn't say that.

But first off, what he just read of on July 8th, I

1 could not access on PACER.gov nor was I ever served a copy. And that's the first I ever heard of it when he read those words, a 2 3 July 8th document that Kevin Norman filed. It's sealed. 4 can't -- I can't look at it on PACER. I did not receive it in 5 the mail. No one handed me a copy. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. BERNEGGER: Okay? 8 THE COURT: Yeah, that's the problem --9 MR. BERNEGGER: So I had no clue --10 THE COURT: That's a problem because I think 11 Mr. Norman is used to cases where attorneys are on both sides. 12 And if he's going to send a notice to -- for a review hearing, 13 he needs to give Mr. Bernegger a copy of the review hearings 14 that he would file with the court. So, Ms. Kosmoski --15 MR. BERNEGGER: And, Your Honor, I object --16 THE COURT: Mr. Bernegger, let me -- don't talk over 17 me. 18 Ms. Kosmoski, would you remind Mr. Norman of that so 19 that --20 PROBATION OFFICER: I think --21 THE COURT: -- if he's going to send something to the 22 court that is going to be in the record concerning 23 Mr. Bernegger, Mr. Bernegger is not represented by counsel so he 24 needs a copy. Is there a problem with that?

PROBATION OFFICER: No. I'll review it with the clerk

25

of courts, too.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, Mr. Bernegger, what were you going to say?

MR. BERNEGGER: Your Honor, the prosecutor, Mr. Roach, is misrepresenting what the Mississippi court ordered. And first off, it's document no. 458. It states on page 32, line 9, "The defendant shall participate in a debtor's examination as requested by the government."

I did. I did that. In fact, at the May 24th hearing, Mr. Roach admitted that I did that. It's in the transcript of the May 24th hearing. I complied with the FLU requirement. There's no -- it doesn't even -- first off, it doesn't even state the word "FLU" or "financial litigation unit" at all anywhere. Okay?

THE COURT: Okay. Let me go back to Mr. Roach.

Mr. Roach, did you say there was a separate order aside from what Mr. Bernegger --

MR. ROACH: I'm looking at an order. It's document no. 454 from the court. And the order details reasons -- this related to a prior revocation hearing where Mr. Bernegger wasn't making restitution payments and doing other things, and this specific order lists the same terms of supervised release that he had always been under --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROACH: -- prior to that.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me make things clear,

Mr. Bernegger. Now, I recognize you did not receive notice that

we would address FLU today and -- because you didn't get a copy

of Mr. Norman's report to the court. I don't find that

prejudicial, though. If I'm wrong you can tell me and you

can -- you can ask for reconsideration. But at this time I am

going to order you to complete the financial litigation unit's

questionnaire --

Is that right, Mr. Roach?

MR. ROACH: It's a debtor statement. It's also financial statement and related documents, including tax returns, documentation of income, bank statements and the like.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm directing -- and these are the documents that Mr. Norman has provided you. I'm directing that you complete those so that Probation has the information it needs concerning your financial situation so they can assess whether or not you're able to pay anything.

Now, how lengthy are these documents, Mr. Roach?

MR. ROACH: They're multiple pages. As the defendant said, he was ordered to complete them in 2016, some time ago,

THE COURT: Ms. Kosmoski has a copy?

MR. ROACH: -- time has passed.

THE COURT: Can you show me?

Yeah, okay. So it's entitled, "Financial Statement."

And it's in the United States District Court for the Eastern

District of Wisconsin. And it is a seven-page form with a

attachment that asks -- you know, the listing of like furniture,

VCRs, things like that. Tools. And that attachment is -- four

pages.

So I'm going to direct that Mr. Bernegger complete this financial statement and return it to Mr. Norman within two weeks of today's date. So that would be what, the 26th of July? 25th of -- no, July 26th. Thank you.

And I don't find it prejudicial that Mr. Bernegger did not have specific notice that this would be addressed. I think he's aware that his ability to pay restitution is really the focus of the hearings. And this relates to that. So I'm going to direct that you do that, Mr. Bernegger. And we'll modify the condition.

Do we have -- the conditions that he's under are attached to the judgment of the district -- the judgment from the District of -- the Northern District of Mississippi?

MR. ROACH: I believe so.

THE COURT: I think we should -- we need -- since now I have this case and we've added conditions, I imagine I should -- do I have jurisdiction to amend a judgment from that court? Or how -- I guess I'll just order that these conditions apply. And this condition and the other conditions, since this court is now -- has the case transferred -- the case has been

transferred to me, I'll order that you do that, Mr. Bernegger.

I should have said at the outset, I know Mr. Bernegger filed a number of motions today. There's one that I think I should address and should have addressed right away, that is, demand for my recusal. I'm going to deny that. There is no basis for my recusing myself. I'm satisfied that I'm able to deal with this case fairly and I think I've done so. I also don't want to turn -- or direct -- or transfer that case to another judge in the district who are all overburdened. And I don't think they'd be in any better position to handle it than I would be, especially since they're in Milwaukee and I'm in Green Bay.

The other motions Mr. Bernegger have filed are essentially against seeking to compel members of the probation office to do certain things, to appear in certain ways; as he said, provide him evidence.

There is no issue here today other than

Mr. Bernegger's ability and his history of trying to comply with
the conditions that we've imposed. Mr. Bernegger is in the best
position to know that. And Mr. Bernegger needs to establish
that there is some basis -- I'm not going to simply allow him to
call people whoever he wants for any purpose.

If he establishes that there is some cause, some relevant purpose of calling a member of probation to testify,

I'd certainly listen to that. But where the question I've asked

him is what have you done to find employment and what have you done -- what are your physical problems that prevent you from working, he's the one in the best position to know that. And Ms. Kosmoski is not a doctor, nor was she with him when he complied, nor is she even the agent handling his case. And whatever the agent would have would have come presumably from Ms. Kosmoski.

Mr. Norman, although, like I said at the beginning, has indicated that it appears that "Mr. Bernegger has consistently provided our office with employment search efforts." And Mr. Norman isn't here.

So I take it from Mr. Norman's update to the review hearing -- and a copy of this should be provided to Mr. Bernegger. I'll direct the clerk to mail it to him.

But, Mr. Roach, am I correct, there's no action being sought in terms of revocation, or there's no allegation that he has failed to comply with the conditions of supervised release that I sent?

MR. ROACH: Other than the FLU related matter and the Court's addressed that here today.

THE COURT: Yeah, we've made that clear now to the extent that it wasn't already clear to Mr. Bernegger that he needs to complete that. And so I'll --

MR. BERNEGGER: Your Honor, I was waiting to -- I don't want to overtalk, over-speak you, but I'm objecting to the

FLU condition. The FLU condition is a special condition. I was required by the Seventh Circuit, it's mandated that I'm noticed well in advance of the hearing that a special condition would be imposed, whether it's modified or added, before the hearing starts, which means at least three days according to the Seventh Circuit.

And I'm also required to be noticed in advance, a Rule 32.1(b)(2)(A) and (B). And the Seventh Circuit backs it up that I'm supposed to be noticed if it's mandated. If it's a special condition, I have to be adequately noticed well before the hearing starts and I wasn't. I object to that.

MR. ROACH: Judge, this is not a new condition. The order that was previously in place not only referenced the financial document requirement, but there was also a specific supervised release condition that he shall submit to a debtor's examination conducted by the FLU unit of the U.S. Attorney's Office.

That's a little ambiguous. It came to the court from Mississippi, whether it's referencing this court or whether it was simply referencing the supervised release that was in existence in '16. So it's been a part of his condition.

MR. BERNEGGER: No, objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROACH: We're just asking for a new --

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on a minute. Hold on a

minute.

MR. ROACH: We're simply asking for a new exam because the other one is dated, at this point.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Mr. Bernegger?

MR. BERNEGGER: I move to strike that written order because the verbal order in document no. 458, page 32, line 8 and 9 -- I'm sorry, 9 and 10, line 9 and 10 -- takes precedence over a written order. So I move to strike the written order.

THE COURT: The oral order says what, that you did comply with that?

MR. BERNEGGER: The oral order says, again -- and this is document no. 458, page 32, lines 9 and 10. It says, "The defendant shall participate in a debtor's examination as requested by the government." I did. I did it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNEGGER: Mr. Roach admitted I did it at the May 24th hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. So your argument is that you've complied with that condition.

MR. BERNEGGER: I have.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to vacate my previous order. We're going to be back in this court on next Friday, July 19th, at 3:30 in the afternoon. And the issue to address is the addition of the FLU financial responsibility statement. Mr. Bernegger, be prepared to address it.

1 I am proposing that you be given one week until July 26th to complete that form. You can argue to the contrary next 2 3 week and tell me why that should not be ordered based upon your 4 crime and the history in the case, and I'll listen at that time. 5 MR. BERNEGGER: Your Honor, I already have a motion 6 filed a couple weeks ago regarding challenging the FLU where the 7 Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, the D.C. Circuit Court of 8 Appeals, the Federal Tax Court all ruled that FLU cannot meddle 9 in a district court's restitution order and cannot take any 10 steps whatsoever to collect the data. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I will look at your motion. 12 MR. BERNEGGER: It's already on the record. 13 THE COURT: It's document number what? 14 MR. BERNEGGER: I don't have the document number 15 handy. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I will review that motion. 17 Mr. Roach, you review it as well, and be prepared to respond. 18 MR. ROACH: Thank you. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? 20 MR. BERNEGGER: Yes, Your Honor. On your text order 21 yesterday it says my "explanations for his failure" -- me -- to 22 pay restitution. I paid the restitution, the hundred dollars. 23 I paid it on June 23rd. 24 THE COURT: Well, that's not restitution, that's

your -- oh, you paid a hundred dollars?

25

1 MR. BERNEGGER: I paid a hundred dollars. 2 THE COURT: So you have been making your payments. So 3 you're making the payments and you're looking for employment. 4 MR. BERNEGGER: But I would move the Court to change 5 the docket to correct it so it's accurate. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Well, if you've made payments --7 and I didn't realize that because I thought you were unable to 8 find employment and that your health prevented you from making 9 payments. So I'll direct that the clerk, the minutes reflect --10 First of all, Ms. Kosmoski, is that -- the clerk 11 indicates he's made the payment? 12 MR. ROACH: The updated memo indicates that defendant 13 made a payment, one \$100 payment, on May 24th. 14 THE COURT: May 24th. Has he made a payment since 15 then though? 16 MR. ROACH: The update memo dated July 8th does not 17 indicate any other payments. 18 THE COURT: Did you make a payment after that? 19 MR. BERNEGGER: No, I did not. I made a payment on 20 June 23rd. And I want to submit to the Court the receipt for 21 it. 22 THE COURT: No, Ms. Kosmoski is admitting that. 23 that right? 24 PROBATION OFFICER: The report lists that he made a 25 payment on June 21st.

THE COURT: Okay. And we're in July. So he's current. So the minutes should reflect that Mr. Bernegger is current on his payments.

MR. ROACH: My error. I looked at the wrong date. June 21st.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you know -- so we'll address that additional condition next Friday at 3:30.

And we will address Mr. Bernegger's argument that such a condition is improper based on caselaw in other circuits. I'm not sure it meddles in restitution orders. Ultimately it does seem to me when someone owes \$1.7 million in restitution as a result of a criminal conviction, it does seem that getting financial information from that person is a reasonable effort to enforce the judgment. But I'll look and see if Mr. Bernegger has --

MR. BERNEGGER: Your Honor, what I'd like to state for the record is that on June 3rd is the very first time ever that Kevin Norman or anybody else asked me for FLU information with the exception back in 2016, which I already satisfied.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNEGGER: June 6 is when Mr. Norman emailed me requesting probationary forms, Probationary Form 48 and 48B to be filled out, which is a net worth statement and a cash flow statement. I filled those out and they were returned to him on time. He has my financial information already.

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's --2 PROBATION OFFICER: That's accurate, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: That's accurate. Mr. Roach, now, FLU is 4 getting ready for a time when he's off probation or off his 5 supervision? 6 MR. ROACH: Yes. 7 THE COURT: And his five years on supervision will 8 expire in September. 9 MR. ROACH: Correct. That's why it's imperative that 10 FLU has those documents and can start making plans for attempted 11 collection of restitution and making victims whole. 12 THE COURT: And, Mr. Bernegger, is it your position 13 that FLU is not entitled to that information at all or just not 14 now? 15 MR. BERNEGGER: The three case laws that I cited in 16 brief, but they are written in detail in the pleadings that are before this court, filed maybe two weeks ago, maybe three weeks 17 18 ago --19 THE COURT: Mr. Bernegger, you file an awful lot.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernegger, you file an awful lot.

Just let me say that. You file so many things. And in all honesty, I don't have time to keep up on it all.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BERNEGGER: It has been ruled by two federal circuit courts and also the Federal Tax Court, and those cases are cited in my pleadings, is that they have determined by a statutory construction is that FLU has no business getting

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

involved in a U.S. district court's restitution order until the person is off of probation.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNEGGER: And it's the same thing as if the BOP was meddling right now in my restitution when I'm on supervised They don't have any authority to do it. And that's what those three federal courts ruled.

THE COURT: Okay. Were those collection efforts or efforts to get information?

MR. BERNEGGER: It was both. And the rulings were stating specifically that any attempt for a debt collection could not be done specifically when the person was current on his restitution-ordered monthly payment, which I am.

THE COURT: All right.

PROBATION OFFICER: So, Your Honor, it's very common, in fact, a practice of our office to connect the financial litigation unit and our clients as they prepare to be terminated, our office typically makes a recommendation about whether someone is willfully paying or willfully not paying, and in that consideration we consider their willingness to cooperate with FLU.

So I do just want to put on the record that if Mr. Bernegger refuses to cooperate with FLU, that would be something our office would consider then in a recommendation about his supervision continuing or not continuing.

1 THE COURT: Is there -- I mean, is there a possibility 2 that your office may recommend a extension of supervision of 3 Mr. Bernegger? 4 PROBATION OFFICER: I believe --5 THE COURT: He had five years. 6 PROBATION OFFICER: Correct. 7 THE COURT: That's the maximum amount. 8 PROBATION OFFICER: I'm not certain on that. 9 THE COURT: Yeah. Well, that issue isn't here. 10 certainly we would certainly want to give lots of notice before 11 we did that. 12 PROBATION OFFICER: Right. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Bernegger, if you remain current and 14 you're right in your interpretation of FLU, then I won't 15 reimpose that condition. I'll look closely at both those cases. 16 Okay. Anything else? 17 MR. BERNEGGER: No. 18 MR. ROACH: No. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 (Hearing concluded at 4:05 p.m.) 21 22 23 24 25

CERTIFICATE

I, JOHN T. SCHINDHELM, RMR, CRR, Official Court
Reporter and Transcriptionist for the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, do hereby certify
that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription
of the audio file provided in the aforementioned matter to the
best of my skill and ability.

Signed and Certified July 26, 2019.

/s/John T. Schindhelm

John T. Schindhelm

John T. Schindhelm, RPR, RMR, CRR United States Official Reporter 517 E Wisconsin Ave., Rm 236, Milwaukee, WI 53202 Website: WWW.JOHNSCHINDHELM.COM

